PROTESTANT
CHRISTIANITY
THOMAS B CHETWOOD S.J.

To

Vincent A. McCormick S.J.

with the

affectionate regards

of the Author

J. B. Chetwood S.J.

PROTESTANT CHRISTIANITY

By

THOMAS B. CHETWOOD
OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

ALMA COLLEGE
282
LIBRARY
C426
Los Gatos, Calif.

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE
CANCELED DUPLICATE
WOODSTOCK COLLEGE LIBRARY
LIBRARY

PHILADELPHIA
THE PETER REILLY COMPANY
PUBLISHERS—IMPORTERS
LONDON: B. HERDER
1926

62565

Imprimi potest
LAWRENCE J. KELLY, S.J.
Praep. Prov. Marylalandiae—Neo Ebor.

Nihil obstat
ARTHUR J. SCANLAN,
Censor Librorum.

Imprimatur
+PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES,
Archbishop, New York.

Printed in the United States
Copyright, 1925, THE PETER REILLY CO.

TO MY FATHER

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Virgin Birth of Christ	11
Anathema?	28
Dr. Parks, Modernist	39
Henry VIII and the Anglican Church .	61
Dean Inge: Artist and Catholic Apologist	79
Appendix	93

INTRODUCTION

TO use what might be called a working division, there are three schools of thought among Protestant Christian thinkers today which we may call the High, the Middle, and the Low. The last, the Low, is typified by men like William Ralph Inge, the "gloomy Dean" of St. Paul's. I am far from attempting to synopsize or even denominate correctly his school, for it is hydra-headed and unified by no other principle than what one might call good sportsmanship, which consists in open-air free-for-all stalking, straight shooting and fair acknowledgment of the quarry that every fellow-hunter brings down. The game that is quested is new or at least renovated religious opinions which they find and make their own. They are the true Modernists.

The first school I have called the High. It is at the opposite pole from Dean Inge. It seeks, as the same writer rather caustically points out, to reconcile contradictions. It would take—if you will pardon the flavor of

slang—the 'protest' out of Protestant and yet retain the rejection of Papal authority which rejection is the very soul and essence of Protestantism now as in the beginning. Still they are bound together and individualized by the intensity of their devotion to certain ancient points of doctrine which they call fundamentals, and in fiercely resisting all attempts to revise these fundamentals or subject them to the analysis of modern critical methods. They are not one in numbering and defining these fundamentals but they are one in their devotion to those they name. They are aptly named Fundamentalists.

The second or Middle school is the hardest to define and yet in my opinion the most popular of all. It is a reconciling or blending of both the first and the last school—although its followers are far more likely to call themselves Modernists than Fundamentalists. For this last division profess a warm and even solemn regard for the researches and revolutionary findings of the free-ranging Low school and still at the same time either implicitly or explicitly cling to certain old beliefs which research or argument will never

deprive them of. Dr. Leighton Parks is, in our thinking, a plain professed member of this school.

All three schools can count men of ability and so do not lack able exposers and apologists. The tenets of all these three are touched upon in the following pages. The only general remarks which a Jesuit Priest standing outside it all is inspired to make is to point to the Great Shadow that falls upon all these Christian scholars as they charge and countercharge and wheel and grapple. Sometimes the tilting champions feel the Shadow and they shiver with fear or shudder with hate. Sometimes they turn their faces up at the source of it with a wistful look and glistening eye. But the looming, patient Shadow wraps them all and changes not. It is the Shadow of the ancient Church standing foursquare to every wind of doctrine.

To portray this spectacle—not without its artistic value—of the rival schools and the brooding Shadow is the purpose of the subjoined essays. This it is that gives them, taken together, unity and dependence one on the other.

The author wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to the editors of Truth for permission to publish in book-form the subjoined articles.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST

IT is authentically recorded in the biography of Ignatius of Loyola that he once fell in with a Morisco or Saracen Moor, and was drawn into a discussion concerning the virginity of the Mother of Christ. The unbeliever conceded that Mary was a virgin up to the conception of Christ but ceased therefrom and thereafter to have a right to that title. The progress and form of the argument are not recorded, but the outcome was that Ignatius utterly failed to convince the Saracen, and such was the indignation into which the knight's defeated zeal developed that he came within an ace of using his dagger to chastise the blasphemer and thus retrieve his lack of success in controversy. This was in the first months of the Saint's conversion before he had hung up his sword forever and set himself to use far different weapons. But the incident is a most instructive one, for it is no exaggeration to say that if all the learning of

all the most learned members of that Order which Ignatius afterwards founded and fathered could have been concentrated on that same Saracen in the interest of the same conclusion to which Ignatius failed to drive him (and it is granted their learning was considerable) there is no reason to expect for them more success than had the new-converted cavalier.

And so in the lists against the modern cavilers at the privilege of Mary we are faced with the same difficulty and menaced with the same failure. It is true these cavilers do not call themselves Saracens, but in strict truth they are further away and more difficult. For the Saracen graciously conceded that the Mother of the Great Prophet was a virgin when she became His Mother, but these modern doubters depending on some etymological obscurity deny even that.

The difficulty of proof in this matter is derived from the assumptions necessary. All proof, as sound philosophy teaches, begins with assumptions. If we endeavor to prove all our proofs we shall soon bring up at scepticism or the repudiation of proof itself. Our

assumptions necessarily vary with our audiences. If we are facing those who call themselves Atheists we can have nothing to say except to wish them an early recovery from what is nothing more or less than a subtle mental and moral disease.

If, however, a Deist stood before us, one, I mean, who believes in God the Creator but in no Revelation, no divine Church on earth, we should have to be satisfied with establishing not proof but presumptions. You believe, we should say, that God was the Maker of all things—then you must believe in the *possibility* that He who made our nature should in some mysterious way put on our nature. No, He could not cease to be God nor could He work any change within His unchangeable Self but as He reached marvelously out of Himself and His eternity to make a world and begin time and breathe an endless life into a nature that He created, all which should stand in a new and real relation towards Him denominating Him Creator—so He could by a greater reach single out a particular nature and make it more His than merely His creature, make it His by real assuming, by binding

it to His Personality as closely as the nature of each man is bound to his own personality. He could do this at the initial instant of the created life of this nature so that never for a single instant of its existence would that nature be concluded made concrete by a human personality, but only and always by a divine one, never would belong to any person but to Him. And all the deliberate actions of that nature, of bodily motion, of thought, and of will would be attributable to Him, would be His just as my deliberate actions are *not* His but *mine*.

The Deist might break in here "This is a most tremendous thing. It strains and staggers the reason to look at it."

Right, we answer, but you cannot say there is anything impossible in it.

"No—but it is a far, far cry from establishing it as absolutely possible to making it actually so."

Right again—a distance that only the arm of God could bridge. But look at it only as a hypothesis. If God wrought such a wonder as to take to Himself a nature that He made, so as in a certain sense to leap visibly down into

a world which before He only invisibly permeated and presided over, is it not possible that to signalize so unspeakable a marvel He would set aside some laws?

Well, not those laws which reflect His nature and to which He is committed by His nature. He could not, for instance, utter a lie, for that is essentially evil and His nature is incompatible with evil. Nor could He make a square circle, for that is a contradiction and His nature is essentially consistent with itself. But He could set aside those laws which He arbitrarily made when He arbitrarily hung this world and no other in its place. To come down to more detail. We observe about us a number of beings which we call living and that they generate or reproduce their species according to fixed laws. To you who are a Deist and who admit that a Being without beginning must have begun all things, it is superlatively clear that the first of these generated and generating beings must have been produced without generation and therefore not according to the laws of generation which only began to exist forthwith. Our Deist

"What laws?" answers the Deist.

nods. Turn back now to that dazzling hypothesis that the Maker is about to enter His world, is it not possible, at least possible that He would suspend the ordinary laws of generation and begin this singular and astounding double existence in a singular way?

"It is all possible," the Deist answers, "even comparatively easy to suppose in the strong light of the first hypothesis that the Creator would yoke Himself personally with a nature made by Him. So, if God should become man, as you Christians put it, there is no absolute reason why He should not become man without the aid of man. But we are dealing with probabilities as well as possibilities," the Deist goes on, "and it can't help occurring to me that there is an argument against the probability of this parthenogenesis of the God of the Christians. For the whole idea savors very strongly of paganism, which, I take it, Christianity is opposed to if not subversive of in every detail. Now you must know that the idea of heroes and demi-gods and even deities being born in an extraordinary way is much older than the Christian era and multiplied into many instances. The examples of Mi-

nerva among the Greeks and Horus among the Egyptians come to my mind and there are many others. Does it not seem improbable that God would adopt a miraculous method of being conceived and born which had been long before and widely commemorated in the fancy of false creeds? For thus, in our supposition, we must denominate the Pagan cults."

You are not entirely right there, my dear Deist. No creed is altogether false which inculcates reverence for God or God's agent. After all, we were all made by the same God. Our supposition rests on the unqualified truth of that. And the instinct in the human breast reaching out reverentially toward Him is everywhere literally a spark of the same fire though it may differ in brightness and degree. Applying this to your statement about the parthenogenesis of demi-gods, etc., it is an example of eminently true religious instinct on the part of Pagans—this endeavor to sanctify in legend the account of the coming into the world of a divinity or a divinely commissioned emissary by making his conception and birth a suspension of the ordinary laws of nature. Shall the devout fancy of heathens

dare more for their demi-gods than the true God would dare when He actually becomes incarnate?

But all this we frankly admit to our benevolent friend, the Deist, can do no more than establish the presumption—the mild presumption that the Creator would take such a means of signalizing His incarnaion if such a tremendous design were, indeed, His. We must move forward but we will beg our Deist not to depart. It is so soothing to discuss with him. His perception is simple and clear and, so to call it, unsectarian.

Let us only assume then that the Great Maker of the World became man, was conceived and born of a Virgin Mother—that she who was inexpressibly the elect of all women ministered all that was necessary to make her a mother from the very beginning, yet suffered nothing that made her cease for an instant to be a virgin, that the power of God made her fertile and that same Power kept her inviolate. It hardly needs argument to assert that assuming the fact of all this God would wish to make the fact known to men. He does not casually or wantonly exercise His

power and supersede His laws. If the Incarnation had a significance and a purpose so had every detail of so truly divine a work. To enumerate the possible ways in which God might reveal this work of His to the generations of men who should come to life after it was done—this were a fruitless task for there is no limit or clue to the possibilities of Divine invention. We have only one question here for our friend, the Deist: If God could become man through a Virgin He could certainly have the fact written down in a book. You admit that?

"I admit that, perforce," he answers.

Well now, I am going to synopsize for you some brief passages from three books. One is many hundred years older than the other two and they are all many hundred years older than we are. No one questions this. The first book is called the Prophecy of Isaias and was written long before the Christian era. We are told therein how there was a king named Achaz, whose kingdom was encompassed and threatened by his enemies, and in these dire straits he was approached by Isaias in God's name and with God's commission.

Isaias tells him that God will overthrow his enemies, but on condition that he believes. Then he urges the king to profess his faith in God by inviting a sign, a message from God—which message Isaias himself holds ready to deliver. The king's faith is not forthcoming, so Isaias, rebuking him, says he himself will proclaim God's message, but not so much for Achaz as for his house, the House of David, which, in spite of its recalcritant members, has been an object of God's extraordinary predilection recorded by the same Isaias. "Therefore," says Isaias, "the Lord Himself shall give you a sign: behold a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son and his name shall be called Emmanuel." This name in Hebrew signifies precisely "God with us."

The second book which we shall open and read is called the Gospel of Luke and is much more matter-of-fact in style than the Prophecy of Isaias, as well as some seven centuries later in the date of its composition. This book purports to be a simple and circumstantial report of things that happened in the life of the writer. It tells of a virgin who was the espoused wife of a man named Joseph—and

how this virgin was visited by a messenger direct from God who announced to her that she should conceive and bring forth a Son who should be called the Son of the Most High. The virgin meekly indicates a difficulty to the accomplishment of this in words that plainly show that though an espoused wife she has renounced the privilege and expectation of motherhood. (It is equally plainly implied that this renouncement had been made out of a devout desire to please God else she would hardly have confessed it without faltering to an unearthly divine messenger.) The messenger answers at once, not by bidding her to recall her renouncement, which he should at once have done if such were his instructions, but he predicts in mystical and withal vague terms that God's power shall overshadow her. Then his words flash into clearness when he adds that the Holy that shall be born of her will be called the Son of God. So that this overshadowing of her by God's power is nothing else than the fathering of a Child in her—a Child who will therefore be called the Son of God.

Thus far Luke's book. Next we place be-

side this another account by a man named Matthew, a contemporary of Luke's, writing of the same events as Luke whose account he supplements. He tells in the same straightforward style how, when that virgin was forthwith found to be with child, her husband Joseph was minded to put her away—until God warned him in sleep of the divine origin of the Child. There is something terrible in this to Christian ears. God, who is about to enter the world allows a foul suspicion to rest for a time upon her whom He chose to be His mother, in order to make plain beyond the utmost reach of cavil the statement that He entered the world without the aid of man. The last words of the account which we quote are a fitting climax for they link up the account with an utterance seven centuries earlier. "Now all this was done," Matthew concludes, "that it might be fulfilled which was said by the Lord through the prophet, "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son." So that if Matthew's word is to be taken, the wondrous sign anciently predicted to Achaz was nothing else than the virgin conception and birth of Him Who was called Emmanuel.

"I am bound to admit," our good friend, the Deist, remarks here, "that assuming the books of Isaias and Luke and Matthew to be God's books containing naught but His message, the Virgin Birth of Christ could not by power of plain writing be made clearer. But has Christian opinion been unanimous on the divine character of those books and the integrity of those particular passages?"

It was by Christian opinion—nay, Christian conviction, that those books were anciently sorted from others and set for all Christians as containing God's exact words. As for the sense of the passages quoted, listen to the testimony of the Christian consciousness extending over nineteen hundred years. We shall let Isaias the Protevangelist stand separate, pointing forward across seven centuries. We begin with Matthew and Luke whose works even the most carping scholarship must admit belong to the first century of our era. Then come the earliest symbola or epitomes of the Christian Faith emerging from the age of the Apostles all bearing the words "born of the Virgin Mary." Equally explicit is the

Apologia of Aristides*[1] which belongs to the first half of the second century and sets forth the universal belief of Christians at that time. St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch[2], who lived when many men yet living had seen Christ, wrote that the virginity of Mary was one of the three great mysteries of our Faith "to be cried aloud." "Mankind is saved through a virgin," wrote St. Irenæus[3], disciple of Polycarp, disciple of John the Evangelist. The passage from Isaias, quoted before, was very early dear to Christian devotion as is seen from symbolic paintings on the walls of the Catacombs dating back to the year 150; and that this passage signifies the perpetual virginity of Mary before, in and after her motherhood is proclaimed by St. Justin[4] the philosopher and martyr in the second century, by Origen[5] in the third, by St. Eusebius[6] in the fourth, St. Jerome[7], St. Chrysostom[8] and Theodoret[9] in the fifth, St. Isidore[10] and St. Ildefonsus[11] in the sixth. These supereminent teachers, bear in mind, were not setting forth rare and recondite opinions but the explicit

---

* See the notes in the Appendix according to numbers.

faith of the century in which they lived and their words point not forward but back to a message given long before. The mighty Jerome silenced with a very hurricane of invective Jovinianus and Helvidus[16] who questioned the perpetual virginity of Christ's mother and the whole Christian world applauded. St. Epiphanius[12] of Cyprus is equally severe. St. Ambrose[13] of Milan brands such teaching "sacrilege." St. Augustine[14], the light of Africa, calls it "heresy." St. Bede[15], of England, names it perfidy. In the year 649 the Lateran Council (non-Ecumenical) once more gave definite expression to the corporate faith of Christendom by declaring that "the ever-virgin Mary conceived without aid of man and brought forth a Son without detriment to her virginity and retained this virginity after His birth." From that time all through the next nine centuries Christian worship both of teachers and taught is loud and unmistakable in its prayer for the intercession of "Blessed Mary ever-virgin"—and so it has lasted up to the present day in that part of the body of Christians which united under one head professes a homogeneous Faith. Now

what, my dear Deist, do you make of all this as a mere fact?

The Deist answers thoughtfully: "It is all so much a part of the hypothesis of Christianity itself that the denial of it makes Christianity not only stagger but fall down flat. For Christianity is nothing if not a divine message addressed to all mankind of all time. The kernel and soul of that message is the coming of the divine Christ into the world, an event accurately set down in books divinely certified to and interpreted by teachers divinely commissioned and received by an undying body of learners divinely protected. If the books have been garbled or the teachers corrupted or victimized by delusion, or the great mass of learners hoodwinked, then the message forfeits its claim to divinity and the coming of Christ degenerates into a mere historical curiosity, which controversy must stoop over and disentangle from lies and legends. For a divine message that cannot make itself heard with equal distinctness across the span of a hundred or a thousand or two thousand years is the poorest kind of travesty on divinity. It is like the lame god Vulcan or the bat-

tered, bawling god Mars of the old classic tales. And what I fail to see clearly is upon what ground persons can deny this and still call themselves Christians. Do they think that Christ after Whom they are named took no means to let succeeding ages know surely how He was born, or do they think He has communicated the right account to them each one personally rather than to Isaias or Matthew or the corporate consciousness of Christian antiquity?"

My answer is that I don't know. What I do know is that they have lost the instinct that made even John Milton sing for the tender Christmas season of

". . . the Son of Heaven's eternal King
Of wedded maid and virgin mother born."

I see nothing else in their loss than the decay or rather the debauching of Christian instinct. This does sound bitter but remember Loyola at the end reached for his dagger.

ANATHEMA?

THE way of the Protestant Bishop is a hard one in this land of liberty. Only within recent memory a prominent New York pastor * defied his Bishop, who had taken solemn exception to his teaching. There was rejoinder and counter-check but in the end the Bishop swallowed the defiance, and the pastor went on with his teaching. Even more recently an equally prominent pastor, Dr. Leighton Parks, with the added dignity of long years of service and a name above the shadow of reproach, flings a defiance † not merely at his Bishop, but at a whole Synod of Bishops of his communion, because they dare to impose on him a dogmatic formula for his doctrinal guidance.

---

* Rev. Percy Stickney Grant.

† Since the first writing of the above Dr. Parks has publicly repudiated any intention, on his own part, of defiance. He has not, however, repudiated any part of his stand.

The venerable man speaks with strong conviction. But is he right? Are not Protestant Bishops definitely empowered to indicate lines of teaching for the clergymen under them? Can they not say: "Teach as we tell you or go elsewhere"? It is true there is a Bible but no one but a fool would call that Book in itself, sacred as it is, a security against difference of opinion. The different interpretations of the Bible would fill many books, each one subversive of the other. So, if the voice of the Bishops is not above the Bible or at least if the words of Holy Writ do not need any living voice to make them clear and unequivocal, then the good Bishops surely wear their mitres in vain.

Dr. Leighton Parks enjoys the accredited title of Pastor of the Protestant Episcopal Church, thereby declaring his connection with a wide and well-known movement among the body of Christians which can claim nearly four hundred years of life. This movement is called Protestantism, and it definitely signifies and definitely embodies a protest against something. But against what? Against authority. And what authority? This last

question can best be answered by a paragraph expanding the panorama of Christendom before Protestantism was born, when that authority was in full swing against which Protestantism so definitely and so successfully protested.

In the fifteenth century, in the midst of wars and wranglings, practically all Christendom sat unprotesting at the feet of a Teacher. And the scope of this Teacher's authority extended to all matters of religious belief. It taught that Christ was Divine, definitely one nature with Him who made all things, but beside that it taught with equal solemnity that Christ had committed to a magisterial body a message, a code of doctrine, which that body should preserve and purvey, and that He had added the assurance of perpetuity to that body and of infallibility in the purveying of the deposit of doctrine. In other words, it taught the divinity of the Church as a companion, nay more, as a correlative dogma with the Divinity of Christ. Needless to add there could be no appeal from the teachings of a divine Teacher. The Sacredness of the Scriptures was explicitly taught together with their

divine origin but with the following important provisions. The Scriptures were not fundamental but only incidental to the Church's mission. That is to say, the Scriptures were given to the Church already a full-fledged and fully furnished teacher to whose warrant and authority they could add nothing, since it was already divine, and whose message they could neither enlarge nor correct, since it was already definite. Therefore, the Church was above the Scriptures in exactly the same sense that the author of any book is above the book. For the Church was the living and abiding voice of Him Who wrote the Scriptures. Nor did the Chruch strangle free opinion, as the often tediously long theological controversies of those times testify. But the Church was always near with an unclosing eye not only in theological but in purely scientific discussion as well, always ready to point out where the hedge of dogma began which marked the end of free opinion—of all opinion. As I observed before, Christendom quietly acquiesced in this state of things. Sporadic outcries only emphasized the prevailing contentment and Christian States stood ready with the awful

penal code of those days to punish heresy like highway robbery or treason.

Then came the explosion. A very large portion of Christendom protested. The protest was many-tuned according to the taste or convictions of the protester. New leaders constantly raised new banners on which were inscribed the exaltation of certain tenets and the excoriation of others. But on one dogma or on the rejection of one dogma they were all united, they were all dogmatic. This was the origin, the essential expression, the soul and breath of their protest, of their protestantism: "The Church is not divine. We deny, we repudiate the divinity of the Church." The greater majority of the protestants upheld the divinity of the Scriptures in whole or in part, just as the majority of them upheld, in so many words, the divinity of Christ. But it was in no dogmatic way. Protestantism was essentially undogmatic. Neither Paul nor anyone else was put in the chair of Peter. The right and office of dogmatic teacher was transferred to one principle and one only—a man's individual conscience and conviction, aided, it may be, by the Scriptures as he read them and

by personal illumination from his God. It is true that this theory was not always consistently followed and sundry protestants at sundry times tried to "pope it" over their neighbors. But this is only because of the inconsistency of human nature, and from its very inconsistency it could have only transient life. Protestantism means nothing if it does not mean emancipation of man's powers of believing, if it does not mean the unqualified denial that there is vested in any man or body of men on earth the right to tell me what I must believe. This is the foundation of the New York clergyman's position against the Bishops. He is vindicating his Protestant birthright when he refuses to shade or change his teaching at the word of another.

To no purpose will the good Bishops urge the historical fact that the Episcopal Church has always stood for certain definite, godly teachings. This amounts to nothing more than historical procedure. Is it not the practice, nay, the prerogative of this age to overthrow, to reverse historical procedure in every field save none—in science, in government, in war and in Religion, too? Historical pro-

cedure as such carries no sacredness—nothing to deny that it is the crystallized folly of other generations, a shackle for progress to break and kick aside the fragments of.

But, again, look at this very historical procedure of the Episcopal Church. It reads clamorously against the good Bishops' contention. It is true that there have been in that body wars and strifes, usurpations and dethronements. Dogmas have shown their heads and then shown their teeth. But they utterly failed in the end and the protestantism of the Episcopal Church prevailed. Dogmas were not outlawed; they were simply disrated and sent into the ranks as opinions. And between the ancient and widely parted boundary-marks called High and Low Church almost beyond number, and certainly beyond classification, are the opinions that find shelter and honorable commonalty. High Churchmen like the eminent Pusey may disclaim the very name of Protestant and purvey all the old dogmas without exception, and Low Churchmen may vehemently reject them all and extol the obvious lines of the Evangel and the tenets of the Evangelicals. Still all is well

as long as dogma abdicates its name and lives as a simple opinion, nor dares arrogate to itself the power from Christ to compel belief or to become dogma. It may well be that some doctrinal opinions are so dear and so clear to the holders that the holders are profoundly convinced they *do* compel belief as from a Divine Teacher. All is still well as long as *this* conviction is only an opinion. If there is anything that has distinguished the Episcopalian Church from the Evangelicals it is this broadening and heigthening of its portals to opinions of every stature. The Evangelicals turn with shrinking and dismay from the old dogmas or from anything that only faintly savors of them. But the Episcopal Church bids them all welcome. There are seats, even thrones for all; but all must remember they are entering a temple of Peace. And no one must carry in under his gown that ancient edged weapon called anathema. Anathema translated into modern parlance means "believe or get out," and the good Bishops to whom we referred in the beginning actually wish to make use of this weapon. Does not the reverend clergyman

stand not only upon his Protestantism but also upon his Protestant Episcopalianism when he refuses to be anathematized?

To no purpose will the good Bishops urge once more, "But these teachings are found in Scripture." It may be so, but learned men have denied it and have brought texts fairly to bear against every text cited in their support. And it is certainly clear to everyone who thinks: first, that theology when it comes to discourse nicely on the meaning of terms is a very technical science; second, that the Scripture is a most untechnical book, and third, and above all, that if you dare to read a single line of Scripture to me and bid me understand it thus and so on your Church's authority you are foreswearing your Protestantism and your Episcopalianism and reversing the emancipation of the sixteenth century.

Let us, finally, try to emphasize and realize this essential insociability of Protestantism with dogma of any kind whatever. There is a passage in the writings of Dean Swift, a good Protestant Episcopalian, almost two hundred years old, in which he retails for the scorn on his friend in Brobdingnag the re-

ligious disputes of Europe at the time. "Difference of opinion," he says, "has cost many lives, for instance, whether flesh be bread or bread be flesh; whether the juice of a certain berry be blood or wine."

Behold the commentary of a great Protestant of imperishable genius expressing the contempt and horror of Protestant Episcopalianism at the shedding of blood over such a thing as a religious opinion. Properly understood he is the Coryphæus of Protestantism sounding for all time its protest against the dogma of the Eucharist. But understand well, Protestantism or at least Episcopalianism does not cry down the opinion that the Flesh of Christ is present in the Sacrament. That opinion has come to have today an honorable place inside the portals of the Episcopal Church. But it cries down the *divinity* of that opinion—or in other words the right of that opinion to coerce the belief of mankind or to be hailed as a dogma.

The definition of the Episcopal Church in the light of fair examination is as follows: A congregation of Christian teachers and taught professing veneration for the name of Christ

and for the sublimity of moral teachings identified with that name, bound together by a ritual which is unchangeable only in one respect: namely, that it must ever express decent veneration for decent Christian usage, and by a Prayer Book, variously interpreted but vaguely inculcating the same decent veneration; *but repudiating as a Church any divine dogmatic authority as vested in itself and consequently the power to declare or enforce any religious tenet as divine.*

In light of this definition the Reverend Dr. Parks is unassailable as stately in the sombre gown of his profession he declares: "when the Church of England broke away from Catholic tradition it gave to each minister an equal authority with his Bishop."

DR. PARKS, MODERNIST

ON December 16, 1923, Rev. Leighton Parks, D.D., preached in the Church of St. Bartholomew, New York City, of which he is pastor, a sermon entitled "Intellectual Integrity, or The Equal Rights of Fundamentalist and Modernist in a Comprehensive Church." The sermon was the reply to a Pastoral letter issued by the Synod of American Episcopal Bishops, and opened a new chapter in the controversy which still rages between the sectaries of Protestant Christianity. It is sufficiently important as containing the views and viewpoint of a powerful and ever-growing school of Protestant thought, and the author, too, commands a respectful hearing from long, distinguished years of service to his communion as well as for the impression of honest conviction which his words convey. Inspired, then, by this respect and deference I undertake to make a few comments on the sermon

in question, the text of which, revised and amended by the author, lies before me.

At the outset Dr. Parks repudiates anything like magisterial authority in the Protestant Episcopal Church, that is, he denies there is a power residing in any person or body within that church to dictate belief to the rest. He shows how democracy is written deep in the constitution of the Episcopal Church of America so that not even the "formularies" can be changed without "concurrent action of the Lower House, composed of clergy and laity." He asserts that each priest of the English Church (the parent stock of the Episcopal Church here) is given at his ordination "co-ordinate authority with his bishops for the defense and definition of the Faith." He concedes to the bishops disciplinary power but no doctrinal pre-eminence whatever or right to teach finally either singly or collectively.

I have developed elsewhere* the concurrence of all right thinking men with Dr. Parks in this position and so I only repeat here that it is a position that the logic of history and

---

* Vid. "Anathema?"

historic precedent make abundantly clear, make unassailable.

The second point in the Doctor's position is that he rejects Catholic tradition. The passage in which he does it is so striking and rings with such splendid honesty that I quote it in full:

"If I believed that the doctrine of my Church or my interpretation of it was to be finally tested by the Catholic tradition I should not waste my time amongst you people. The time left is short and as I want to save my soul, I would go up to the corner of Madison Avenue and Fiftieth Street and ask Archbishop Hayes what Catholic tradition is. He knows and he is the representative of a Church which for centuries has declared that the Catholic tradition is the final interpreter of the Scriptures and that Catholic tradition can only be proclaimed infallibly by the Bishop of Rome. It is a perfectly consistent doctrine and if we are to appeal to the Catholic tradition let us go to those who know what it is and have the authority to expound it. But in doing so let us recognize that we should pass

out of an American Protestant Church into the august Church of Rome."

The Doctor does not say what Catholic tradition is. In fact, he says with frank explicitness that he does not know and that he questions if the Bishops know either.

"We do not know when it (i. e., Catholic tradition) began; we do not know exactly what it says. But one thing we do know; *that is when it came to an end.* (The italics are his.) It came to an end at the Protestant Reformation when the English Church deliberately broke with Catholic tradition. . ."

In the course of his exposition, however, the Doctor does show us what he means by Catholic tradition, though he remains as he already confessed himself vague as to its origin and full content. Catholic tradition, according to him, is a sum of religious convictions held by Catholics from very early times and guarded entire down to the present day. These convictions are held with a sacredness at least equal to the sacredness of the scriptural statements, for those ancient writings must be interpreted in consonance with these convictions and never in contravention of

them. What we have to consider here particularly is that Dr. Parks definitely repudiates Catholic tradition as he repudiates dogmatic authority in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Now for the positive side of his position. In the first place he definitely accepts the Scriptures. He respectfully quotes his promise before ordination which reads in part: "Will you be diligent . . . in reading the Holy Scriptures *and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same?* (The italics are his.) Then he goes on to say how for almost fifty years he has tried with God's help to be faithful to that promise and has "passed long hours in those studies that I hoped would give me an understanding of those Scriptures."

But are the Scriptures as they stand in their integrity, are they for him a sure and final guide for his belief and his teaching as against the dogmatic authority of Church or Bishops or the collective Catholic tradition, both of which he definitely sets aside? No, they are not. His honesty makes this plain. He quotes with satisfaction the opinions of Dr. Temple, Bishop Colenso and Frederick Dennison Maurice of Drs. Huntington and McKim who

so shocked, he tells us, the Episcopal Church whether in England or America by finding things in the received text of Scripture impossible to square with fact. Moreover, he refers to the "story of Adam and Eve which was recognized as a myth when Darwin published his Descent of Man." Once more when he is referring to the two diametrically opposite opinions concerning the Resurrection of Christ, one declaring that it was a bodily resurrection, and the other that it was a spiritual resurrection and no more, "Both," says Dr. Parks, "can find justification for their interpretation in the Holy Scriptures." In this item, then, of Christian belief—a sufficiently prominent one, surely—the Scripture is ambiguous and so is a futile teacher. Finally he says that, "the best scholars, not the radical minds but conservative scholars" tell us that the first chapter of Matthew and Luke respectively "belong to the introductions to those Gospels which were added after the original authors had finished their work." And so scholarship can rend whole chapters from that ancient Book.

This last word "Scholarship," supplies us at

last with the clue of Dr. Parks' position. In his introductory word he defines as one of the issues at stake in the whole controversy: whether the Modernists are justified in their position by the *best scholars* and he adds, "My scholarship does not warrant me in dogmatizing on questions which can only be decided by years of patient research. My sole object has been to set forth what I understand to be the conclusions of scholarship." His position becomes clearer and clearer through the progress of his discourse. He congratulates the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in their advance from the "fixity of interpretation" of an older day and precisely in their having called in "the best scholars to bear witness." He defers to scholarship for the interpretation of the ancient Nicene Creed and of the Creeds adopted by the Councils of Calcedon and Constantinople. Scholarship must correct the outworn popular beliefs regarding the destiny of the human body as well as those dealing with the location of Heaven and the throne of God. Scholarship can reverse the meaning of texts both in the Old and New Testament and bring to naught old Christian tenets that

looked there for support. While admitting that in this whole controversy the Modernist may be wrong he adds at once, "but in that case the Modernist must be convinced by reason, by sound scholarship and the Holy Scriptures." Which means nothing in the light of the entire context if it does not mean scholarship and scholarship alone interpreting and defining the Scriptures. He deplores the fact that the Bishops who raised the furore with their ill-starred Pastoral did not wait until "scholarship had convinced the Modernists that they were wrong or led the Fundamentalists to adjust themselves to the fact." Last of all in his last appendix he culminates and clarifies to very utterness his whole position. He begins thus, "There is no convincing evidence that the Bishops speak with the authority of scholarship." He goes on to enforce this by pointing out that other gifts than scholarship are responsible for the choice of a Bishop here in America, and then, further, to excuse their lack of scholarship by their many and arduous duties. There are many, on the other hand, of the plain clergy, he declares, who "have found time to make themselves

familiar with the conclusions of the best scholars and therefore their opinion on such questions is more valuable than that of the Bishops." His closing words I shall express in italics.

"And if the Bishops, unconscious of their limitations, insist that questions of scholarship are to be settled by an appeal to ancient tradition, the very foundation of our Protestant Church will be shaken."

The first thing to note about this position is its honesty. Scholarship, then, or human learning, including, of course, the talent and toil of investigation, is the origin and warrant of all Protestant dogma. By this it must be tested, to this it must yield itself to be pared or pruned or bent or readjusted. If only all Protestants whether Fundamentalists or Modernists would deliver themselves in the definite terms of a position like this!

I have before me two striking and sufficiently typical examples to the contrary.

The first is William Pierson Merril in "Protestantism at the Crossroads," appearing in the *World's Work* for February, 1924. This excellent man squarely divides Protestantism

from the "Religion of authority" or Catholicism, and he solemnly adjures "every denomination of Protestants to decide honestly what it believes Christ and the New Testament count essential for the Christian Church," but in place of saying clearly *how* this is to be decided he serves up rhetorical platitudes leading nowhere except away from the ancient Church which, by the way, he covertly slanders. Why not take a page from honest, venerable Dr. Parks' book and openly hand the key and torch of one's faith to Scholarship?

The other example of a writer who suffers grievously in a comparison with Dr. Parks is the Rev. Shirly C. Hughson, O. H. C., who, at the opening of a pamphlet entitled "What Is Modernism?" writes as follows: ". . . some Modernists are ultra-Protestant and some Roman Catholic—and most Modernists of the present day are followers at a greater or less distance of Father George Tyrrell, the late Jesuit."

If the Reverend Hughson means that some Catholics are Modernists in the same sense that some Catholics are murderers and libertines—God save us!—he is right, but, to put

it mildly, rather naive. But if he wishes to insinuate that Modernism finds an honorable haven in the Catholic as in the Episcopal Church then he is flatly dishonest. Father Tyrrell's opinions procured his expulsion first from his Order and then from his Church. Imagine Dr. Parks playing with veiled half-assertions!

To return then to the position made luminously plain by an honest, outspeaking man. Scholarship must finally correct and define the articles of his faith in place of dogmatic authority whether Papal or Protestant-Episcopal, in place of Catholic tradition and finally in place of the integral, literal text of Holy Scripture.

Dr. Parks is a Christian teacher. His life and his life efforts make that clear. In the light of this fact, therefore, we must expand his term scholarship. It is a gift from God, Who made and furnished the world. It is a lamp which He has put into man's hand so that by it he may investigate many hidden things. I will not rhetorically question whether Dr. Parks admits that God has revealed secrets at divers times to other men

than scholars, for I know that the Doctor would not question this. He must, however, by the logic of his position, insist that these messages will appear right and sane and consistent only when they have been subjected to the test of scholarship, and if they fail in this test they are clearly proven spurious and not from God at all.

This is all reasonable enough. The voice of right scholarship is the voice of right reason and this is nothing else but the whisper of God. And no message of God can be read against right reason, else we should have to blasphemously picture the Maker of all things whispering a message to us in one ear and the contradiction of it in the other.

But we must not take scholarship in the abstract, but in the concrete, and we are concerned here with precisely that scholarship which Dr. Parks invokes and applies. How does his scholarship stand up as the guide and norm of Faith? For, bear well in mind, Faith can brook no stammering or hesitation in its guide.

First, he quotes the best scholars to amend the ancient text of Scripture. They tell us,

he says, that the first chapters respectively of Matthew and Luke were added after the original authors had finished their work, and "that record represents a theory that came into the Church after those Gospels were written."

But here scholarship is at some variance with itself, for other scholars at least equally eminent and untouched by the bias of Christian tradition have examined this excision of a part of the gospel text and found that it is without reason. And it is certainly unsupported by the slightest fragment of documentary proof. For there is not a single manuscript of the Bible where the texts in question are not found complete in every single substantial word and so in all quotations therefrom through centuries of commentary and transcription.

Again he quotes the "best scholars" as telling us that in the classic passage of Isaias 7:14, "a virgin shall conceive and bear a son," the Hebrew word "Almah," translated "virgin," really means nothing more than "a young woman." But those familiar with the Hebrew text point out that same word "Almah" is

used in other earlier passages of the Scripture where it can only mean "a maiden inviolate." For instance, Genesis 24:43, or Canticle of Canticles, 6:7 (6:8 in the Revised Version). Moreover, there is the obvious deduction from the lines that immediately precede the above that the "sign" that God is called upon to give "either unto the depths of hell or the heights above"; that is, a marvel out of the farthest range of God's uttermost universe, could hardly have been the conception of a son by a married woman.*

Finally, he goes to considerable pains in the concentration of Scripture texts upon the proof of the real natural paternity of St. Joseph and the rejection of the virginity of Christ's mother.

All these texts have been in the eye of the Church for nearly two thousand years. The Church has preserved them entire as God's exact word and with them has preserved the explicit teaching that Mary was ever a Virgin. The texts themselves fairly establish two things: First, those that deal with the geneal-

* See Appendix, Notes 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11.

ogy of Joseph and his fatherhood of Christ establish his legal or levirate paternity and the consequent legal descent of Christ from David; the last point being of the highest importance for identifying the Messias to Jewish eyes. Second, those that deal with the descent of Christ from David "according to the flesh" do no more than assert that his one true natural mother was also descended from David. Her genealogy may be omitted, but her motherhood and her virginity are both plainly told for scholar and simple reader alike. Any tampering with the texts has all the appearance, I retort the Doctor's words upon him, of trying "to make the facts (the recorded facts of Scripture) accord with a theory instead of deducing a theory from the facts." But what I mainly find fault with in this scholarship which Dr. Parks invokes is not that it is insecure, but that it is to no purpose. It leads nowhere. It yields nothing but a license to doubt. What has all the scholarship available to him impelled him to *believe* and secured him in the belief of? He doesn't say. Can it be that it has yielded only desolation and destruction?

And now we come to a citation of scholarship on the part of Dr. Parks which I can scarcely believe bears his true subscription. It must, yes, it *must* have been the fruit of irritation or some other inconsiderate mood. For it is a scholarship that not only could never evoke faith but it even dishonors, I say it deliberately, the most ordinary calm intelligence. I speak of his reference to the discoveries in the natural sciences as revising and correcting the ancient articles of belief. He refers to the findings of Professor Darwin which showed that the "story of Adam and Eve was a myth" and to the rejection by astronomers of the Ptolemaic system leading to the evident "incongruity in supposing that the physical body of Our Lord was lifted up from the Mount of Olives to the throne of God at some point above the visible firmament" and finally, he asserts, that now no intelligent man believes that the dead bodies rise from the grave, and so the Modernist cannot be "unchurched" for believing in the mere "spiritual Resurrection of Our Lord."

This is a most fantastic departure of scholarship. I can only call it scholarship gone

mad. It reminds me of the frantic king in the Greek legend who, assuming the role of Jupiter, drove his chariot over a hollow bridge to imitate thunder and hurled burning torches to right and left for thunderbolts. To take a more modern and less sonorous example, the Rev. Charles Francis Potter, of New York, is quoted as saying in a recent debate that the only instances of Virgin Birth or parthenogenesis that had been established were those of the insect kingdom. He mentions among other examples that of the plant louse.

Note well that it is precisely as Christian or even godly that this scholarship is found so ridiculously unscholarly. For the Christian scholar implicitly at least declares that he has received his powers of investigation from the Creator. He uses these powers to find out some few of the ways and by-ways that the Creator has trodden, so to speak, here and there across His own universe. And having found them he turns his face up at the Creator and says, "Thus far shalt Thou go and no farther. Do not dare to build a Heaven or set Thy throne outside the spaces that our astronomical calculations have charted and

pricked off. Nor dare to hide the body of Thy Christ where our telescopes cannot find it." Or, "We have found out certain facts about the progress and propagation of life on this planet, so we are able to tell Thee how Thou didst inaugurate life at the very beginning. Don't attempt to tell us otherwise." Or, once more, "the bodies of the dead which Thou didst furnish temporarily with souls are now in the grip of the iron law of the re-distribution of matter, which law Thou art powerless against. And Thou wilt never reassemble nor reconstruct those bodies, much less make them rise again; because Thou canst not. Dost Thou hear? Thou canst not!" All this makes me hear again the old Greek King driving his chariot back and forth, back and forth, over the hollow bridge, or see Dr. Potter, gesturing to be heard, bent double over his microscope and his lice.

If these scholars would only renounce the name and the profession of Christian they could breath so much more freely and fly unimpeded. "God, if there be any, is unknown and unknowable and human reason is the only source of kowledge"—while it may not be an

unassailable proposition, still it clears the field definitely and lets us know what to expect. It is like rival clowns in the old pantomime who have deprived us of the right of criticizing their good sense, for they are professedly embarked in a contest of extravagant nonsense.

There is a fine example of this in H. G. Wells, one of the most eminent living publicists, who, in his brilliant and pregnant style, delivers himself at length on the subject of religion in his book called *God, the Invisible King*. Here is no paltering nor half-measures. The whole assemblage of Christian beliefs, Trinity, Incarnation, all are imperiously branded as "morbid elaborations of the human intelligence" and relegated to the discard. His research has even supplied him with a personal description of St. Athanasius, whom he calls "Little, red-haired, wire pulling." Once the ground is swept clear of dogmas then H. G. Wells becomes dogmatizer. He is grand and masterful, considerably more self-assured than most of the Popes. He gives us not merely a new religious code, but a new god. His god or pagod is not in-

finite nor a creator, but struggling as we are with great world forces of evil and pain, flung out with us we know not whence and borne with us we know not whither. God is the captain of a shipwrecked, drifting world with no clear endowment but courage.

It is not to the point to discuss H. G. Wells' improvisations but only to remark that H. G. typifies the logical results of making scholarship the last and only warrant of our religious beliefs. For if scholars alone have found for me all that I must believe and if I can have no tenet so sacred but I must yield it up at the voice of scholarship then I will break free from the whole poring, boring lot and rise on the wings of imagination to look down serenely on them and on all they have built. Scholarship can give me no article of Faith but only conclusions, and "no one," as Newman so aptly says, "will be a martyr for a conclusion."

I turn back to Dr. Parks. Do I think he would subscribe to this apotheosis of scholarship, whithersoever the logic of his admissions may lead? I am profoundly convinced to the contrary. I am deeply moved by his reference

to his near fifty years of toil for his flock, how he has, "baptized their children, has brought the boys and girls to Confirmation, has blessed the marriage of the young, knelt by the bedside of the sick, walked hand in hand with them through the Valley of the Shadow of Death." No! the voices of those years are loud in protest. He has not been the Apostle of Scholarship. And there are convictions in his heart, sacred messages that he would not for a moment submit to the impious examination of scholars. Neither from scholarship did he receive them nor to scholarship would he yield them up. They are his against a whole host of Darwins, Potters and H. G. Wells. And if I were privileged to ask the origin of these convictions, these sacred messages, the Doctor would answer thus: "They come to me from the lips of a saintly mother or some early priestly, likely unscholared, preceptor or they shine out plain to me from the lines of Holy Writ." "But," I would answer, "you have not yet shown how you are sure they are true." "I am sure they are true," he would answer, "because I *believe they are God's message.*"

Ah! God's message—that sure enough is a motive and ground of your faith which scholarship could never give you. But if God can send a message to an individual soul as He has to yours so He can deal with an individual Church and that, Doctor, is Tradition. Oh no. He has not *so* dealt with the Protestant Episcopal Church. You have made that clear. For where there is no authority there is no divine message. You can maintain that triumphantly against all the Fundamentalists both great and small.*

---

* Author's Note.—I have lately received a letter from Dr. Parks full of tender courtesy. I quote the following from the letter:

> "I wish I might have read your article before preaching the sermon on which you comment. For had I done so I might have made clearer my understanding of the value of scholarship. I do not think scholarship is the test of *faith* but only of knowledge, especially of historical documents."

These words were not written in a controversial spirit, and I shall make no controversial comment on them whatever. A quotation from Duns Scotus comes to my mind, "As a stone against a stone bringeth forth a spark, so, in the clash of wits, truth is illumined."

HENRY VIII AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

A PAMPHLET came lately into our hands by the Rev. S. C. Hughson, entitled "The Anglican Church and Henry VIII." * Its only claim to controversial notice is the fact that it expresses the present religious position of a sufficiently large number of the Episcopalian Communion, both in this country and in England. The statements in the pamphlet may be summarized as follows:

(1) It is false to say that Henry VIII founded the Church of England. His quarrel with the Pope and his proscription of Papal jurisdiction in England was extrinsic or merely incidental to the life of the English Church. This quarrel and break with Rome is paralleled "again and again" in the middle ages.

---

* The Anglican Church and Henry VIII, by Rev. S. C. Hughson, O.H.C. With a commendatory letter by The Right Reverend F. Gailor, S.T.D., President of the National Council. West Park, N. Y. Holy Cross Press.

(2) The reigning Popes, contemporaries of Henry and his children after him, subscribed to the above statement by their silence. For not one of them for "thirty-six years" after the first break ever once warned their English flock that the Church of England was not truly Catholic. And more to that effect.

Let us discuss first the first of these statements. Is it false that Henry VIII founded the Church of England?

Mr. Hughson's characterization of the Tudor as one guilty of a "career of murder, lust and cruelty" is substantially endorsed by all historians so that we can start together there. But what did this monster do? Infuriated by the Pope's opposition to his designs against his lawful wife he formulated and fixed by law his notorious and momentous Act of Supremacy by which all jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff came to an end in England and at the same time vested in his own person and that of his successors all the jurisdiction formerly exercised by the aforesaid Roman Pontiff. In what numbers the English people, lay and clerical, followed their monarch at the time it is impossible to state

with accuracy. Some, and no trifling number, hailed the event with joy; for the movings of the religious revolt in Europe had not been unfelt in England. Some bided their time and their faith in terror and some, like Thomas More and Bishop Fisher and the meek-faced Carthusians, withstood the King and suffered public execution. But one thing is sure. The Government, the official voice of the nation, acquiesced in the design of the bloody despot and England was nationally severed from a position which she had nationally held since the days of Augustine—not far from one thousand years. And this severance, if you except the futile interval of Mary Tudor, has never been healed, up to the present day. This is the plain reading of history which Mr. Hughson will surely not dispute. To say that this event finds any parallel in the earlier history of Christendom is, to use a gentle word, untrue. Quarrels there were in sad abundance between Emperors and Kings and Popes. Excessive claims were pressed and threatening words were used, but no man in medieval Europe ever cut a whole nation adrift from the

See of Peter and anchored that nation in its separation.

Take the example of the first two Henrys of the Plantagenet line in their ecclesiastical disputes. The first bitterly contended with Anselm over the right of investiture, the second with Becket over the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts. In the first case the King accepted the final ruling of Rome and in the second Becket triumphed in his blood and the King did humble penance at his tomb and England without so much as a flutter kept on in the beaten path of nations. All the other examples which can be cited ran precisely the same course and came to the same termination with perhaps a trifling difference of duration.

Different was the sequel nearly four centuries later in England. Henry Tudor was too cunning to pose as an heresiarch. He was loud in his protestations of loyalty to the ancient doctrines, even promulgated sound Catholic dogma and burnt dissenters, but his accomplishment of separation from the centre of doctrinal unity was his real and only religious legacy to the nation he ruled. Swiftly,

if secretly, through the land the flame of the new doctrines spread, for the hand that had corrected or crushed them was now gone. The King's famous tools, Cranmer and Cromwell, were Lutheran or Calvinistic in tendency. They cultivated the royal favor by aiding in the defamation and spoilation of Rome, but avoided the royal anger by dissembling their opinions. Then came the King's death and the ministers of the boy-King Edward VI threw off the mask and perpetrated among other Protestant achievements the Books of Common Prayer to supersede the Mass which had formerly bound the whole Christian world together in worship. Mary Tudor came and went, a brief and pathetic failure, for the nation had tasted too deep of the wine of freedom which Henry had ministered to it. Then came Elisabeth who, in her excuse be it said, saw that she must be either a Protestant queen or no queen at all. With Tudor force she went to work; for a queen she would be. Her sister's enactments of reunion were reversed, the Pope's authority was proscribed once more, desks took the place by law of altars, and the Second Book of Common

Prayer with the Bible (which every man read as he listed) took the place of the Mass and the living voice which formerly all Christians heard and obeyed.

Was not Elisabeth then the author of the English Anti-Roman Church? No more than was Peter or Paul the founder of the Church of Christ. She only promulgated what she had received. Brutal is the exact testimony of history. Just as her existence was the fruit of Henry's adultery, so her headship of the new Church was the fruit and flower of his rebellion. And to masterful hands was the legacy committed. Sealed with the blood of priests and recusants, strengthened by the baffled invasion of Catholic Spain, sounded in song and story on land and sea, the Protestantizing of England went on until, at the end of the reign of the spinster queen, patriot and Protestant sounded as one. Thus was Henry VIII the founder of the Church of England.

But Mr. Hughson will interpose here, and so will many other good earnest men and women who would be Catholic without being Roman. "That is not true," they will cry out;

"Or only half true. The Church of England received nothing from Henry except emancipation from the jurisdiction of Rome. You have admitted that Henry forced no heresy on the Church and she imbibed none. Individual members were tainted and fell away. The same is true of every Church in every age. But the body of the faithful stood firm through persecution and trial handing on their faith from age to age and she, the Church of England, stands today integral a true branch of the true Church."

Let us first let this statement stand unassailed as an hypothesis. Grant for the present that the Church of England received from Henry emancipation from Rome and nothing more. Is such a gift a seal or a stigma on the Church that received it? If Papal jurisdiction was the bane from which God would mercifully purge and purify His English Church, would He employ a hand and an occasion like Henry Tudor's? Think of it!—the protagonist and apostle of a purer religious freedom for the Church of England, a bloody slayer of his friends, a spoiler of shrines and monastic houses, a profligate who, with a sweet, sainted

wife at home, contracted marriage with a woman whose sister he had kept, whose mother—it is averred by strong authority—he had debauched so that wide rumor once proclaimed him the paramour of his own natural child. And the occasion of the move that freed England from Rome was not even softened by the pretext of reform or resistance to aggression. It was a brutally frank determination of the King to secure scope for his lust by exiling from his kingdom the only power that could bridle it. It was the desire to obtain sanction for a marriage which, when his passion had tired of its new object, he peremptorily declared null and void from the beginning, proceeded to fresh nuptials and then on from bride to bride—while the national Church of England was forced to tread obediently to the music of the royal wedding bells which grimly kept ringing, ringing. What a pitiful brand for a Church to wear on her forehead down the years! For no real historian can qualify by one shade or jot the truth that the English national Church received her freedom from Rome from the leprous hands of Henry Tudor.

But this is not the whole truth. More was bequeathed by Henry to the Church of England than mere freedom from Rome. At first sight the legacy is something vague and intangible, unlike the plain-stated dictums of Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, but it presently becomes clear enough. The Pope was driven from England not only as a spiritual ruler but also as spiritual teacher. No longer could he interpret to the English nation as to the members of his world-family the message of Christ. His jurisdiction Henry took to himself and handed down whole and entire to his successors, but the prerogative of supreme teacher he could not assume or hand down. He might fume and rage and condemn heretics to the stake, but no one would be such a fool—least of all Henry—as to claim for the Kings of England the power to interpret Christ's message to the nation. What became of this power, then, to teach with authority? It ceased in the Church of England—extinguished, snuffed out by the hand that strongly broke the bonds with Rome. Ah, how the history of the Church of England and her status from generation to generation verifies this to

the last letter! Not only Rome may not teach England with divine authority but neither may the English Church nor any other Church.

No one of the sects is such a generous haven for opinions as the Church of England. They range from zenith to nadir. The Eucharist contains the true Body of Christ. The Eucharist contains naught but bread to commemorate the supper of the Lord. The Virgin Birth and its denial. Baptismal Regeneration and its denial. Every shade of doctrine from those savoring of the Evangelical and, be it whispered, the Unitarian, up to the tenets of Pusey and the Tractarians. All are safe between the ample boundaries of High Church and Low. None depreciates a man's standing as a sound English Churchman. All are godly teaching, but not one is divine so as to be able to raise its head and demand belief under pain of anathema. This is the heresy that the Church of England was inspired with by Henry when he started her on her career of freedom. This she has kept safe and unimpaired together with her freedom from that day to this. One dogma Tudor-made and Tudor-given informs the Church of

England and gives it character and coherence, viz.: "Rome dare not teach us as Rome dare not rule us"—and the dogma—so to call it, correlative to this is equally the spirit and breath of the English Church, viz.: "No one dare teach us as Rome once did—no power dare pope it over the Church of England."

I remember quite recently in a prosperous British colony when the Anglican Bishop received a mitre from some of his ritualistic flock. At once a storm of protest was heard from those who thought such things Roman innovations. The good bishop poured oil on the controversy at length by proclaiming that he would use the mitre in his visitations only in those places where his flock would not be offended by it. Let no one pope it over the Church of England! Again, it was not long ago my privilege to enjoy the cordial acquaintance of a dignitary, lower than a bishop, of the same Church. We were conversing once on religious matters and he assured me that his theological opinions coincided pretty much with my own. "And do you teach such doctrines to your people?" I inquired. "Ah, no!" he replied. "For I have a mixed con-

gregation and many would not appreciate them." Verily, let no one pope it over the Church of England. Finally, I once had as the companion of a long railroad journey an excellent bishop of the Anglican Communion. He was very High Church and, withal, a thorough Christian gentleman. We found many sympathetic subjects to discuss until, at last, the way opening naturally, I asked his permission to propound him a question. With sincere courtesy he consented and I proceeded to state the examples of two Anglican clergymen, both well known to him and both active and in excellent standing in the ministry. One openly maintained that the Eucharist contained the Body of Christ together with His divinity and so demanded our adoration. The other equally openly held the Eucharist to be a purely commemorative rite with no Christ present in it whatever. "Now how, my lord," said I, "do you reconcile this with membership in the same communion?" The good man answered a little sadly, but without protest: "That is one of the weaknesses of our Church." All honor to his noble sincerity, and no honest man can gainsay his words and

call that "weakness" local or limited to here and there. That weakness is the gaping wound which Henry's hand inflicted on the English Church, through which her spirit fled and which time shall never heal.

A shrewd controversialist might interpose here. "If Henry robbed the English Church of the authority to teach, or if the national Church of England cherished no longer or delivered no longer to her people a coherent code once Henry had stricken her, then Henry did not found a Church, but destroyed one. For a Church without a definite message or power to enforce her message is no church at all, and Mr. Hughson is right.

I bow to the cogency of the logic and yield to Mr. Hughson. But I will put my capitulation in the form of a dilemma for that reverend gentleman's benefit, viz.: either the Church of England is or is not a real church. If it is not, then most assuredly it was not founded by Henry VIII. If, on the other hand, that haven of heterodoxy and orthodoxy, that Babel of discord without governance in which no ear can find and fix one positive note, if that be a real Church then it owes

its origin, its character and complexion to Henry Tudor, King of England, and to him alone.

But I somehow cannot leave the matter here. For I am keenly and deeply conscious that there are a sufficiently large number of earnest-minded Anglicans here and abroad who will with a bitter sigh admit the truth of most that I have said. "It is true," they will say, "that the Church of England was under most scandalous circumstances cut adrift from Rome. It is true that she has suffered sorely from the separation, true that her teaching voice cruelly halts or is criminally silent, true that she shelters heresies and parleys with strange teachers; yea, and it is true that Rome in spite, we are bound to remark, of some local exaggerations in her worship and some historic scandals in some of her great ones, has strongly kept and surely taught all the doctrines dear to our hearts which Christ first gave. But can it not be—is it not *also* true that some of us Anglican Catholics—deny us not the name—have kept the Faith that radiates from the Seven Sacraments and the Mass, kept it from Henry's time till now? Cannot

our position be justified as (to use the words of another Anglican divine who leaned forward and whispered them in my ear) *missionaries* in the Church of England?"

I can only answer, "My friends, a Church is nothing if it is not a society and, if from God, a Divine Society. And if a Divine Society, then the Authority which binds it together is divine as well. Then it follows that even if you cherish all the God-given tenets and teachings of this Society, but refuse to obey and so deny the Divinity of its authority, there is one God-given teaching which you reject, and hence you cannot be fairly cleared of the name, gently we say it, 'Heretic.'

"I was about to write 'finis,' but Mr. Hughson has caught my arm: 'Wait a moment,' he says with gentle sternness, 'you have forgotten my irrefutable difficulty about the Popes who for thirty-six years never once warned their English flock against the Church of England. You have forgotten that and my dilemma, viz.: Either the Popes were remiss or the Church of England in their eyes was orthodox and sound.'"

Yes, I had forgotten, and now I am, I con-

fess, at a loss to choose an answer. Why did not the Popes denounce Henry's Church? Well, first, I venture, because it was not necessary. Henry stood self-denounced as the enemy of all decency.

"But the heresy in England," Mr. Hughson urges.

As to what errors caught from the German Reformation were making head in England, these had been already dealt with. Why waste more words on them?

"But the heresy of renouncing the Pope's authority—why was not that branded?"

Again we might answer, "A waste of words." But perhaps a better reply is that the Popes dealt gently with this national acquiescence in rebellion, setting it down to fear of a frenzied despot whose frenzy they thought would destroy itself and peace return naturally. They seemed borne out in this when Mary Tudor mounted the throne and the Te Deum of reunion was sung in St. Peter's.

"But why"—and Mr. Hughson's voice rises in vehemence—"why did not the Popes, during all that time declare that the ministrations of

the English Clergy, who had ceased to adhere to Rome, were worthless, since they *had not even valid Orders* and their *Sacraments possessed no more efficacy than did the ministrations of an Arab dervish?"* (The italics designate Mr. Hughson's exact words.)

The reason why the Popes did not make a proclamation of this kind is simply because it would have been glaring heresy so to do as it would be today. Your theology is a bit defective here, my good sir. Did you not know that the sacerdotal powers of a priest or bishop inhere in his very spirit and defy the efforts of everyone including the holder himself to divest him of them? So that all duly ordained priests and bishops of Henry's time or later could, if they did not alter the sacramental forms, validly administer all the sacraments, even though they had renounced and cursed the Pope, adhered to Henry's Church, preached Lutheranism, taken wives to themselves and in other ways conformed to the fashion of the day.

As to the question whether valid Orders and hence valid sacraments have *continued* in that wraith of a Church of England down to

the present time, that has been examined carefully and finally answered elsewhere and does not bear upon the matter in hand.

I hope this deals sufficiently with Mr. Hughson's difficulty, for I am far from fancying a seat on the horns of his dilemma.

DEAN INGE: ARTIST AND CATHOLIC APOLOGIST

EVERY true artist is an artist in spite of himself. But when an artist becomes an apologist, a defender of the very position which he has constantly in season and out of season assailed, he is a spectacle out of rule and worth considering. Such a spectacle is the Rev. William R. (Dean) Inge who, under the drivings and passions of his art delivered himself some time ago of an essay entitled, "Catholic Church and Anglo-Saxon Mind."* Essays which deal with and depend on statistics are always unconscionably boring while those that deal unstatistically with phenomena are delightful if done, like this one, with ability. "Statistics," says the Dean at the outset, "are not available," and by these words he builds a hedge about his platform through which statisticians may only peer and point while he is left to work unmolested.

* *Atlantic Monthly,* April, 1923.

The Dean strews, as it were, the approach to his subject with an introductory statement which will make some readers halt and then draw near his canvas with misgiving, if not prejudice. *"A high birth rate," he says, "always indicates a low state of civilization."* (Italics mine.) Then he goes on to declare that the same high birth rate with its implication of low civilization is a national characteristic of French-Canadians, of Australians and New Zealanders at the present day and of New Englanders in the eighteenth century. Now if one is going to hesitate and to haggle over this, there will ensue a loss of equanimity for the appreciation of what follows. How much easier and better to accept it all as true, which can be done by all if we only assume some such definition of civilization as—the search after and acquisition of comfort. This makes all plain for them the highest civilization will be that which yields the maximum comfort, and who would be such a fool as to question the dire discomfort of large families?

We are disembarrassed now to approach the Dean's canvas where he has portrayed a number of phenomena which are of world-propor-

tions and certainly world-interest. We shall consider these not in the order in which they are presented, but rather in the order in which they appeal to us.

First to strike our observation is the phenomenon of a prominent race marching down the highway of time. How refreshing it is in these days of racial heterogeneity when we thought all the blood (the white blood at least) of the world was poured into a common pool, baffling—frantically so—of separation into its original components, how refreshing to contemplate the spectacle of a great and unmixed race extant and active upon earth. The race in question he calls the Nordic. It is a great race with a great history, but particularly great in its isolation. There is in it something which has made it impossible to blend with other races or nations. "We" (viz.: the Nordics), says the Dean, "could not acquire the virtues of the Southern Nations. The Italians (viz.: the non-Nordics), who are our very good friends, do not wish us to copy them; they like us better as we are. 'An Italianized Englishman,' they say, 'is an incarnate devil.'" This Nordic race is Teutonic,

we learn, but although found pure and unmingled in Germany, stops not there alone, for England, discounting an alien remnant, is pure Nordic. The United States, too, is preponderatingly so, for our "gentlemen" are expressions of the type and in fact wide over the world not merely has gone this race, but it stands in unimpaired integrity today. It is distinct by contrast from every other race. What a picture is this superb, gigantic figure fronting the rising sun of a new era, casting a long, sharply defined shadow back along the past. As for statisticians let them stay where they belong and howl on the other side of the hedge. Here in America, where somewhat more than one race finds shelter and sustenance, we are moved to ask how we may distinguish our Nordics. And the Dean does not leave us waiting for an answer. He is silent on physiognomy but he gives us what is far more distinguishing, namely, the distinct and unmistakable moral qualities of the Nordics. He speaks of the "ethical ideal of the North (i. e., Nordic race), which is very different from the ideal of the South" (i. e., non-Nordic races). "The week-day religion of the 'Goth' (another synonym for Nordic) is an ideal of

valor and honor of truthfulness and fair dealings—it is a national character quite distinct and recognizable, the ideal of all classes of the community for many centuries of its history. . . . The Northern (Nordic again) ideal of chivalry is neither Jewish nor Greek nor Roman nor Medieval . . ."

This Nordic or Teutonic race, then, is not only isolated in blood, but in ideals too. Not that the Dean does not graciously defer to good qualities in the other outside races, but they are different and incompatible, through no fault of theirs. The Jew with his national characteristics marvelously preserved through the friction of centuries is, to say the least, an interesting sight, but how puny he looks beside the Nordic!—a race in which chivalry and the love of honor is not merely prized but congenitally inherent like a love of grass in the horse. Such a race is invested with the qualities for all the rule of all the earth. Such a race is the Nordic or Teuton.

But this great Nordic race has worked out a religion for itself as well. Behold the second phenomenon that the Dean makes to flame in perspective on his canvas. It is founded on

Christianity—this religion, but we cannot but feel that Chirstianity is only a poor subordinate element of the finished product. "Christ and His Apostles," says the Dean, "were laymen and they preached a lay-religion of personal devotion with no human mediators. On this basis the Northern" (Nordic) "Europeans built up a system of worship and theology which suited their dawning national consciousness . . . Their religion, like their nationhood, was in the making."

The next element in the Dean's picture we introduce dramatically. This religion, this "system of theology," "built up" by the Nordics "which suited their dawning national consciousness" is nothing else than Protestantism. This will come as something of a shocking revelation to many. For myself I always thought that Protestantism was anything but racial. To me it seemed, in all its multiplicity of sects, ever fertilely multiplying, as the expression of individual taste and invention. And I thought that surely more than one race was responsible for its rise and propagation. Not to present modern names, did not Huss and Calvin and Knox do some good Protestant

constructive work? But I feel the folly of my question. The answer is obvious. Either these men were Nordics or their work is negligible. Dean Inge clinches all by quoting Santayana, whose sentiments he makes his own, thus, "Protestantism is the natural religion of the Teuton raising its head above the flood of Roman and Judean influences."

The Dean now becomes the spokesman for Nordic or Protestant Christianity. Here he addresses himself to a most subtle and difficult task. The sands of the sea could without question be numbered, if one only had time and patience commensurate, and so could the tenets that divide and distinguish all past and present Protestant sects be coerced at last into a list. But to enunciate the theology which all Protestants share, which makes of many one, this I thought hopeless. The Dean is nothing daunted.

I cannot quote him in entirety, but hear the sum of his revelations. The italics are mine. *"The Protestant doctrine that the struggle is the prize, is applied not only to tangible results, but to the pursuit in all its fields. When Lessing said that the search for truth was better than*

the unsought possession of it, he picked out, as Troeltch says, that thread in the web of Protestantism which the modern world is eagerly weaving into its fabric. Protestantism is the religion of the genuinely modern culture, the civilization of experimental science and hopeful political experiments."

This then is Protestantism. It brings union at last out of disunion and order out of disarray. For Protestantism is not the possession or guarding of any truth or collection of truths, but the pursuit of all truths. It is not a creed but a code of action. It is not static but essentially fluent and changeful as it reaches out and masters more and more. Above all it is productive. "Successful production," says the Dean, quoting Calvin, is "the normal way of serving God." How this religion fits to a hair the Nordic race, with its self-reliance and its honest fearlessness. This is the second great world phenomenon that Dean Inge has portrayed for us on his canvas. After the Nordic race, then, comes the religion which that race has forged for itself and in which he makes it stand arrayed as in a suit of finest Milan armor, bright and strong

and glittering, yet adjusted to every fold of the body and flexible to every bend and motion.

The last picture that the Dean gives us is in my thinking the finest of all. Into his portrayal he may have put all his ability though, of course, it is hard to speak with certainty of that. We refer to his delineation of the Catholic Church which gives the title to his essay. At the outset he flings aside what is sometimes called the Anglo-Catholic Church or the Romanizing body within the Church of England. This he calls a contradiction in terms and an experiment that is doomed to failure. He is dealing with the Church of Rome or what he terms with Nordic chivalry the "great Catholic Church."

What I wish to emphasize in this picture is its truth. Caviling Catholics will point to misstatements and irritating inuendoes and vagaries. For instance, he calls the Church "an autocratic militant empire claiming universal sovereignty." Why cry halt till one explains the way in which this is true? Enough that it is true—strictly, solemnly true in every syllable. The order to "teach *all* nations" which

the Church carries, signed and authentic, is too explicit for haggling over or qualifying.

Then he says, "It is a Mediterranean religion through and through."

Why not? It certainly had its origin near the shore of the Mediterranean.

Once more he speaks of the "political" power of the Church.

That will offend many, but why not see it as true? Universal sovereignty the Church does claim, or the right and desire to rule the hearts of all men and therefore all politicians as well—crowned or uncrowned or self-crowned—unless, indeed, politicians are not men.

Finally (and this has already evoked a protest from a watchful Catholic Journal *) he says "every true Catholic is only conditionally a patriot."

But don't you see how true this is? The Dean in this has softened down words which are said to exactly the same effect in a Book which the Church keeps in her bosom. "He that hates not father and mother . . . etc." †

---

* *America.* † Luke 14:26.

Read that passage and you will vindicate the Dean's truthfulness.

In a word it is so much easier to transcend these and other little scruples of misunderstanding and to fix our eyes on the central figure which grows plainer with every stroke of the Dean's brush.

It is the picture of a Church coming out of obscure Palestine and taking its seat in Europe, which came to be called on account of that "Christendom." As to its past history, the Dean is not discursive, but he is explicit on the nearly two thousand years that have elapsed since its origin. He says: "it has never suited the Nordic, who rejected it as soon as they developed a national life and self-consciousness of their own." But in spite of the blow of losing so great a race and having to brook thereafter opposition therefrom; in spite of the fact that there were left to it only the Mediterranean or inferior races, still the Dean paints it big, menacing, undaunted. Let me reproduce his main strokes.

"At the summit of the hierarchy stands the 'supernatural'—the active power of God."

Exactly so. This is the first and last word of the Church's claim to exist at all.

"The idea of progress has no place in its scheme. No importance is attached to the discovery of new truths."

How true! but I would say it less gently. In the Church's treasury new truths are not only unimportant but untrue (pardon the contradiction). Nor can there be any progress until a greater than Christ sends a new set of truths.

He goes on and I would like his words set to Gregorian music. "The object of education is to protect the minds of the young from the influence of secular ideas which might disturb the compact framework of dogmatic belief." I would add: for which belief they are taught they must be ready, at least, to die. He goes on and the picture grows more luminously plain. I cannot quote him in detail, but it must suffice to say that he shows us the Church by warning, by prohibition, by anathema, with suspicious almost furious jealousy guarding every avenue of attack on the parcel of truths that she brought long ago out of Palestine.

I have two observations to make. They

shall be my last. First I wish to say how sharp and masterful is the contrast which the Dean's etching reveals between two religions, Nordic Protestantism and Catholicism—and how clear beyond controversy he makes the reason for their opposition. One is essentially progressive, the other "static" (with small chance of change, for nearly two millenniums have failed to budge it). One is self-sufficient, relying on the splendid human faculties of search and production fearlessly and finely developed in the superb Nordic brand of human nature. The other essentially insufficient in human nature, abjectly reaching outside of human nature for support. As the Dean says so well: "When the Protestant loses his self-reliance he is plunged in despair; but the Catholic abases himself and finds relief."

My last observation is the only critical note in my commentary. The Dean says, with a frankness that I find no fault with, that the Church is an imposture; but he does not offer to account for the phenomenon of the long life of this imposture. He enumerates sundry attractions which the Church offers, but surely he would not have us think any or all of these

sufficient to maintain an imposture so long. If the Nordic race, for instance, to suppose the impossible, dealt in imposture—especially such an imposture as a coherent message from above—would it not more than tax its energy and endurance to keep that imposture undimmed, unrecanted for two thousand years? I suggest an explanation. It was used before and dealt with a similar difficulty. It runs thus: "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils."

APPENDIX

Notes

Note 1. Aristides (wrote between the years 120 and 140 A.D.) first describes the pagan cults in turn followed by Judaism; then: "as for the Christians, they trace their line from the Lord Jesus Christ. He is confessed to be the Son of the most high God who, having descended from heaven by the Holy Ghost for the salvation of mankind, and having been begotten of a pure virgin (ἐκ Παρθένου ἁγίας) without the agency of man (ἀσπόρας τε καὶ ἀφθόρως) he appeared unto men."

Note 2. St. Ignatius, Martyr (lived between 30 and 107 A.D.), in his epistle to the Ephesians, having exhorted the Church of Ephesus at considreable length, proceeds, cc. 18 and 19: For our God (Θεος) Jesus Christ was conceived in the womb by Mary, according to

the plan of God of the seed indeed of David, but by the power of the Holy Ghost, . . . and the Virginity of Mary (ἡ παρθενία Μαρίας – Virginitas Mariæ) was concealed from the prince of this world and her delivery and likewise the death of the Master —three mysteries to be shouted aloud (τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς – tria mysteria clamoris) which in the silence of God were accomplished."

Note 3. St. Irenæus (lived between 120 and 202 A.D.) in his discourse "Against Heresies" (Book V, Chapter 19) institutes a comparison between Eve and the Virgin Mary as follows: "For just as the first (i. e., Eve) was seduced by the speech of an angel so that she fled away from God having transgressed His command; so the second (Mary) through the speech of an angel received the glad news that she should bear God (portaret Deum), obedient to His command. And if the first disobeyed God, still the second was minded God to obey so that the Virgin Mary might become the intercessor for the virgin Eve. And as the

human race was bound over unto death through a virgin, it is saved through a virgin (salvatur per virginem), virginal obedience counter-balancing virginal disobedience."

Note 4. St. Justin, Martyr (lived between the years 114 and 165 A.D.), in his Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew, in which he quotes the Old Testament copiously in defense of Christian tenets, writes as follows, Chap. 84: "And that too, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son' was foretold in reference to Him (Christ). For if he of whom Isaias was speaking was not to be born of a virgin, who is it, after all, of whom the Holy Spirit cried out, 'Behold the Lord Himself will give us a sign: Behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bring forth a son'? For if this one after the fashion of all other first-born sons was to be born from coitus (ex concubitu) why does God Himself say that He will give a sign that is by no means common to all first-born sons?

Note 5. Origen (lived between 185 and 254 A.D.), in his discourse against Celsus (Bk. 1, Chap. 35), writes: "The Lord is related to have spoken to Achaz thus, 'Ask a sign for thyself from the Lord thy God either in the depth or

the height above,' and afterwards the sign is given, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son.' What kind of sign then would that have been—a young woman who was not a virgin giving birth to a child?" After expanding the argument he says at the end: "And these arguments I employ as against a Jew who believes in prophecy."

Note 6. Eusebius (lived between 260 and 340 A.D.), in his Church History (Book V, Chap. 8), quotes Irenæus, whom he calls "one of the ancient priests and writers of the Church" as follows: "Concerning the translation of the inspired Scriptures by the Seventy, hear the very words which he writes, 'God in truth became man and the Lord Himself saved us, giving the sign of the virgin; but not as some say who now venture to translate the Scripture, 'Behold a young woman shall conceive and bring forth a son.' "

Note 7. St. Jerome (lived between 340 and 420 A.D.), in his letter to Eustochium—perhaps the most famous of his letters—having eloquently praised virginity, adds: "In those days (i. e., of the Old Law), as I have said, the virtue of continence was found only in

men: Eve still continued to travail with children. But now that a virgin has conceived in the womb and has borne us a child, of which the prophet says that "Government shall be upon his shoulder and his name shall be called the mighty God, the everlasting father," but now the chain of the curse is broken. Death came through Eve but life has come through Mary."

Note 8. St. John Chrysostom (lived 347 to 407 A.D.), in his Homily on the Seventh Chapter of Isaias, n. 5, having developed in detail the situation of King Achaz, and the sign that God is called upon to give, adds: "Therefore the Lord will give you a sign: Behold a virgin shall conceive! For if it had not been a virgin, it was no sign. For a sign should be outside the ordinary course of events and should surpass the usage of nature . . . and so if the words refer to a woman bringing forth according to the law of nature, why should he call that a sign which is of daily occurrence?"

Note 9. Theodoret (lived between 393 and 457 A.D.), in the first of his "Counter Statements" against St. Cyril of Alexandria, part of an historic controversy between two giants

of theology which served in the end to illumine the True Faith, says, "For that which was conceived in her (Mary) says Gabriel, is of the Holy Ghost . . . Therefore the child is called Emmanuel on account of God who assumed and the Virgin Θεοτοκος (Mother of God) on account of union of the form of God with the conceived form of a servant."

Note 10. St. Isidore, bishop of Seville (lived between 560 and 636 A.D.), in his discourse "Against the Jews," Book I, Chap. 10, writes: "In regard to which passage (i. e., Isaias 7:14) the Jews argue that the prophetic words in Hebrew point to a young woman and not to a virgin who is to bring forth. Against this we argue that there were no sign (*signum*) if a young woman out of her puberty was to bring forth. But this were a sign beyond all measure of experience if a virgin was to bring forth out of her inviolate maidenhood."

Note 11. St. Ildefonsus, bishop of Toledo (lived from the beginning of the seventh century to the year 669 A.D.), in his passionately eloquent treatise, "On the Perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Mary," writes, addressing a

Jewish opponent, Chap. III: "For if, as you say, a young woman and no virgin could bring forth a child, what could the Lord mean? What sort of a wonder was He working? What sort of a marvel was He showing forth? What thing out of the ordinary was He pointing to if a young woman in the course of nature was to bear a child, if a girl in her puberty was to become a mother? . . . But that verily were a sign if a virgin should bring forth and remain inviolate."

Note 12. St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in the Island of Cyprus (lived between 310 and 403 A.D.), in his 78th discourse "Against Heresies," having smitten fiercely those who had denied the divinity of Christ and the trinity of the Godhead, adds, Chap. 23: "And so as to what regards that holy and blessed ever Virgin, some have delivered themselves most abusively against her, so as to say that after the august and supreme mystery of the Incarnation of the Lord she was stained by corporal intercourse, a statement which passes beyond all vileness and impiety."

Note 13. St. Ambrose (lived between 340 and 397), in his discourse on the Education of

a Virgin, writes (Chap. 5): "And, nevertheless, though all are exhorted to the cultivation of virginity by the example of the blessed Mary, there have been those who denied that she persevered a virgin. We had long wished to say no word on this gross sacrilege (*hoc tantum sacrilegium*) but because the matter has been haled to public notice . . . it should not stay uncondemned."

Note 14. St. Augustine (lived 354 to 430), in his sermon (245) on the Trinity and the Incarnation, n. 3: "On the other hand a Jew declares that a virgin could not bring forth contrary to the laws of nature: and a vile Manichæan, 'If she were made of flesh, she could not be a virgin. If a virgin brought forth, it was a delusion!"

Note 15. St. Bede, commonly called Venerable Bede (lived between 672 and 735 A.D.), in his homily on the second chapter of St. John, writes: "There have not been lacking heretics who thought that Joseph, the husband of the ever-blessed Virgin Mary begot of another wife those whom the Scripture calls the brothers of the Lord. Others with grosser perfidy (*majori perfidia*) have thought that he

(Joseph) begot these (brothers) of Mary herself after the Lord's birth. But we, most dear brethren, without any scruple or question, must know that not only the blessed mother of God but also Joseph, the most blessed witness and guardian of her chastity, remained always free from any marital intercourse whatever; and those who are called the brothers and sisters of the Saviour after the common fashion of the Scripture, are not their (Joseph and Mary's) children, but their kinsfolk (*non natos, sed cognatos*)."

Note 16. St. Jerome, in his discourse against Helvidius (n. 4), scores the following point, which is one of many.

Helvidius has quoted the words of Matthew 1:18: "She was found with child before they (i. e., Mary and Joseph) came together," as insinuating that marital intercourse between the above-named took place subsequent to the birth of Christ.

Jerome answers: "If I chose to say, as indeed I might say, Helvidius was cut off by death before he repented, must I be understood to affirm that Helvidius will repent after death?"

Note 17. Dr. Parks goes on to say that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was "clamped on the church by St. Augustine's novel doctrine of original sin."

In the first place the doctrine of original sin is four centuries older than St. Augustine. That is clear to any scholar who does not hold that St. Augustine was the author of St. Paul's Epistles. The assertion that every child born of the procreative act (*ex concubitu*) is affected by the original taint, this is the soul and essence of the doctrine and therefore is as old as the doctrine itself. St. Augustine's "novel doctrine" on original sin is, according to Dr. Parks, the teaching that there is a taint in the procreative act of itself, so that everyone born of wedlock must of necessity by that very fact be tainted. Is this the teaching of St. Augustine? The Doctor's exploration of St. Augustine has convinced him this is so; and, in fact, there *are* in the works of the great bishop, passages which might lead one to such a conclusion. But I waive this point entirely and leave the Doctor's correct interpretation of the Saint uncontested. What I fix on is Dr. Parks' statement that St. Augustine "clamped" his

doctrine on the Church, or in other words that it is the Church's teaching. This is contradicted by the Doctor's own admission of another teaching among the earliest of the Church's dogmas, namely, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. "This last dogma," says Dr. Parks, though it may be "modern in its formal statement, represents the flower of Catholic tradition."

The dogma of the Immaculate Conception teaches that Mary, Christ's mother, was conceived and born free from the taint of original sin. The dogma does not assert nor insinuate that her parents were so born. The dogma does not assert nor insinuate that Mary herself was conceived otherwise than by natural wedlock. Such a theory is legendary and apocryphal and has been *explicitly condemned by the Church.*

The deductions from all this are inevitable. First, the parents of Mary were not taintless since she herself was the *only* taintless one. Second, and most to the point, there is no *formal necessary connection* between conception from ordinary wedlock and original sin because the Virgin Mary was conceived from

ordinary wedlock. So that if St. Augustine teaches anything to the contrary he certainly has not "clamped" it on the Church. I do not wish to crow that these deductions convict Dr. Parks of self-contradiction or of mere surface knowledge of the dogmas which he discusses, but only to repeat gently what I said before that pure scholarship is a lay hand in matters of dogma and a stumbling, uncertain guide for one's Faith.

FINIS

62565